



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,728	01/11/2001	Elliot Schwartz	5168P001	2453

40418 7590 01/24/2006

HEIMLICH LAW
5952 DIAL WAY
SAN JOSE, CA 95129

EXAMINER

MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/759,728	SCHWARTZ, ELLIOT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aravind K. Moorthy	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on 5 November 2005.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-26 have been rejected.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-4, 10, 12, 14-16 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1.**

As to claims 1, 14 and 22, Purtell et al discloses a method for traversing a firewall, comprising:

initiating a first connection to go through the firewall [column 7 line 18 to column 8 line 62];

evaluating the first connection for a response from a remote system
indicating a successful first connection [column 7 line 18 to column 8 line 62];

initiating a second connection to go through the firewall if a successful first connection is not established [column 7 line 18 to column 8 line 62];

evaluating the second connection for a response from a remote system indicating a successful second connection [column 7 line 18 to column 8 line 62];

initiating a third connection to go through the firewall if a successful second connection is not established [column 7 line 18 to column 8 line 62]; and

evaluating the third connection for a response from a remote system indicating a successful third connection [column 7 line 18 to column 8 line 62].

As to claims 2, 15 and 23, Purtell et al discloses that the first connection, the second connection, and the third connection is selected from the group consisting of Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connection, User Datagram Protocol (UDP) connection, hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) connection, hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) connection via a proxy connection, and Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMP) connection [column 3 line 51 to column 4 line 11].

As to claim 3, Purtell et al discloses that initiating a TCP connection comprises initiating a TCP connection to a predefined address and port [column 3 line 51 to column 4 line 11].

As to claim 10, Purtell et al discloses using Internet Protocol (IP) [column 3 line 51 to column 4 line 11].

As to claim 12, Purtell et al discloses using Ethernet with the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) [column 3 line 51 to column 4 line 11].

6. Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Freund U.S. Patent No. 5,987,611.

As to claim 17, Freund discloses a firewall traversal system comprising:

a main system coupled to storage [column 14 line 52 to column 15 line 11];

a communication subsystem coupled to the main system and a communication medium on one side of a firewall [column 5, lines 9-27];

a packet examining subsystem coupled to the communication subsystem [column 5, lines 34-50]; and

a database system coupled to the packet examining subsystem and the main system [column 6, lines 13-27].

As to claim 18, Freund discloses that the packet examining subsystem extracts port information [column 16, lines 8-29].

As to claim 19, Freund discloses that the packet examining subsystem extracts the port information based upon examining packet data content [column 16, lines 8-29].

As to claim 20, Freund discloses that the packet examining subsystem extracts address information [column 13, lines 34-43].

As to claim 21, Freund discloses that the packet examining subsystem extracts the address information based upon examining packet data content [column 13, lines 34-43].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bhide et al U.S. Patent No. 5,852,717.

As to claim 4, Purtell et al does not teach initiating a HTTP connection that comprises initiating a HTTP connection to a predefined address using port 80.

Bhide et al teaches initiating a HTTP connection that comprises initiating a HTTP connection to a predefined address using port 80 [column 5, lines 9-21].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al so that if a HTTP connection were to initiate between a client and server, it would have used a predefined address using port 80.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al by the teaching of Bhide et al because it is well known in the art that a HTTP connection uses port 80. Establishing a connection involves one round-trip time from the client to the server as the client requests to open a network connection and the server responds that a network connection has been opened [column 5, lines 9-21].

8. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fuh et al U.S. Patent No. 6,609,154 B1.

As to claims 5-7 and 9, Purtell et al does not teach that initiating a HTTP connection via a proxy connection further comprises determining a likely proxy address and port. Purtell et al does not teach that determining a likely proxy address and port further comprises packet sniffing. Purtell et al does not teach that packet sniffing further comprises: sampling packets; extracting information from the sampled packets; and building a database of likely proxy addresses and ports. Purtell et al does not teach that extracting information from the sampled packets comprises examining TCP packets for HTTP data.

Fuh et al teaches initiating a HTTP connection via a proxy connection further comprises determining a likely proxy address and port [column 13, lines 3-14]. Fuh et al teaches that determining a likely proxy address and port further comprises packet sniffing [column 9, lines 51-67]. Fuh et al teaches that packet sniffing further comprises: sampling packets; extracting information from the sampled packets; and building a database of likely proxy addresses and ports [column 9, lines 51-67]. Fuh et al teaches that extracting information from the sampled packets comprises examining TCP packets for HTTP data [column 9, lines 51-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al so that there would have been a HTTP connection initiated via a proxy connection that would have determined a likely proxy address and port. Packet sniffing would have occurred during the determining step of the proxy address and port. The firewall packet sniffing would have included sampling packets, extracting

Art Unit: 2131

information from the packets and building a database of likely proxy addresses and ports. The extracted information would have come from examining TCP packets for HTTP data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al by the teaching of Fuh et al because it makes sure that the client is authorized to communicate with a network resource [column 3, lines 54-60].

As to claim 8, Purtell et al teaches that extracting information from the sampled packets comprises extracting TCP port information [column 1 line 50 to column 2 line 3].

9. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fuh et al U.S. Patent No. 6,609,154 B1.

As to claims 11 and 13, Purtell et al does not teach that initiating a HTTP connection via a proxy connection further comprises determining a likely proxy address by sampling packets and extracting IP and Ethernet addresses.

Fuh et al teaches initiating a HTTP connection via a proxy connection further comprises determining a likely proxy address by sampling packets and extracting IP and Ethernet addresses [column 9, lines 51-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al so that a HTTP connection would have been initiated via a proxy connection and proxy addresses would have been determined by sampling packets and extracting IP and Ethernet address.

Art Unit: 2131

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al by the teaching of Fuh et al because it makes sure that the client is authorized to communicate with a network resource [column 3, lines 54-60].

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1 as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Linden et al U.S. Patent No. 6,549,773 B1.

As to claim 16, Purtell et al teaches examining network traffic [column 5, lines 47-67].

Purtell et al does not teach building a database of parameters likely to allow establishment of a HTTP connection via a proxy connection.

Linden et al teaches building a database of parameters likely to allow establishment of a HTTP connection via a proxy connection [column 5, lines 16-26].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al so that a database would have been built of parameters likely to allow establishment of a HTTP connection via a proxy connection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al by the teaching of Linden et al because it is possible to efficiently utilize functions connected with the HTTP data transmission protocol of the WSP/B protocol already known as such. These include, for example, GET, PUT, and POST requests. Consequently, the header fields of the HTTP protocol can also be utilized in the data transmission, as well as the headers of the HTTP protocol for authentication. Correspondingly, it

Art Unit: 2131

is possible to utilize efficiently the methods of the WWW communication network for authorization or data transmission [column 5, lines 16-26].

11. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1 as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Fuh et al U.S. Patent No. 6,609,154 B1.

As to claims 24 and 25, Purtell et al does not teach means for initiating a HTTP connection via a proxy connection further comprises determining a likely proxy address by sniffing packets and extracting information from the packets. Purtell et al does not teach means for initiating a HTTP connection via a proxy connection further comprises determining a likely proxy address by receiving information from a computer connected to the firewall.

Fuh teaches means for initiating a HTTP connection via a proxy connection further comprises determining a likely proxy address by sniffing packets and extracting information from the packets [column 9, lines 51-67]. Fuh teaches means for initiating a HTTP connection via a proxy connection further comprises determining a likely proxy address by receiving information from a computer connected to the firewall [column 9, lines 51-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al so that a HTTP connection would have been initiated via a proxy connection. The firewall would have sniffed packets and extracted information from the packets. Proxy addresses would have been determined by receiving information from the computer connected to the firewall.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al by the teaching of Fuh et al because it makes

Art Unit: 2131

sure that the client is authorized to communicate with a network resource [column 3, lines 54-60].

12. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1 as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Montenegro U.S. Patent No. 6,233,688 B1.

As to claim 26, Purtell et al does not teach means for updating firewall traversal strategies.

Montenegro teaches means for updating firewall traversal strategies [column 6, lines 49-65].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al so that there would have been a firewall that had means for updated firewall traversal strategies.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al by the teaching of Montenegro because it keeps the firewall up to date as far as addressed to block so that the client is not compromised at any time [column 2, lines 7-21].

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aravind K Moorthy 
January 18, 2006


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100